

grant Aid Societies, whereby Lawrence was

MONDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1855.

In consequence of the enormous number of copies now printing THE WEEKLY TRIBUNE, we are compelled to request our readers to send in their advertisements by to-morrow noon, in order to secure their insertion in this week's issue.

DOINGS IN CONGRESS.

Horse, Dec. 29.—There were eight ballots for Speaker to-day, but no debate of ballots.

The trial of Matsell on charge of being a forger commenced on Saturday. Messrs. Noyes and Brantwich appeared for the Briggs Committee, and Stoughton was full feather. The charge is made by Mr. Stuyvesant. Three witnesses were examined, whose affidavits have already been published.

The approbation by the Queen of England of the New-Branswick Prohibitory Liquor-Law has been made public. The law goes into effect on the 1st of January.

The commencement of the trial of the parties indicted for manslaughter in the late Camden and Amboy Railroad murders is fully reported in our paper this morning.

With the mass of news we had to print on Saturday last, there was no room for the statement which we publish to-day of the proceedings in a matter in which we and the public at large take a deep interest—the subject of the much talked of and long prayed-for Central Park. The Commissioners have completed their report, and from the fact that less than one-twelfth in value of the persons interested make any objection to it, we judge have done their duty faithfully. It was to have come up for confirmation, in regular course, on the 21st inst., before Judge Mitchell, but for some reason the Judge was not able to attend it; nor could any of his brethren be found to take his place. The stream of justice did not flow at all on that day in the Supreme Court in New-York City. On the Monday following Judge Roosevelt was assigned to hear it, and if he had been allowed to go on, would no doubt have adjudicated the case with his usual fairness and ability; but unfortunately the grave objections started by the learned counsel for the city have deprived us of the services of the learned justice, for we take it for granted that under the circumstances, both delicacy and a sense of propriety will oblige him to yield his place to another Judge. Indeed, it seems to us that it is manifestly the safer course in a matter of such high moment to defer the case before some Judge from the rural districts—one in no way connected, either personally or through his friends or relatives, with the property in the city. For the good of the whole community, we desire to see the measure carried through; and that promptly. There are thousands of our overworked population who sympathize with us, and who will gladly pay their share of the \$150,000 of additional annual taxation which the land will cost, and the further amount that will be required to make it available for Park purposes.

We call upon the powers that be to grant us the ready boon. The niggardliness and false economy of their predecessors took away the splendid "parade" which the foresight of De Witt Clinton, Pinckney De Witt, and John Rutherford, the Commissioners who laid out the city, established as far back as 1813, and which still mocks us on the old maps of the city. Let them see to it that they do not commit a similar error.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

We have private assurances from a source which we deem worthy of confidence, which lead us to believe that the President's Message will be delivered to Congress in season to be sent out to Europe, at least in substance, by the America, which sails from Boston on Wednesday. Should the election of a Speaker not be consummated to-day there is good reason to expect that the House will either prolong its sitting through the night till to-morrow, or that it will meet to-morrow, notwithstanding the ordinary observance of that day as a holiday. If the Speaker be chosen to-day, which we have not much doubt will be accomplished, the Message will be at once delivered, so that we shall be able to print it to-morrow morning. But if there is no choice of a Speaker there will, under the circumstances, be no cause for surprise if the unusual course of sending in his Message to-morrow without waiting for the organization of the House. Precisely what reasons there may be in the minds of Mr. Pierce and his Cabinet for thus anticipating the regular order of events, we of course do not pretend to be informed; but we repeat that, whether Speaker or no Speaker, our readers need not be alarmed at receiving the Message in an EXTRA TRIBUNE on Tuesday night or Wednesday morning, if they do not receive it before. We repeat that, why this is possible we cannot attempt to state; but we must say, however, that we can conceive that one of Mr. Pierce's Messages should be very hard to keep in a state of tolerable preservation for any considerable length of time; and we dare say the public will hold him excusable for trying to get it out of his house as soon as possible, even if more regard is paid to haste than to the common rules of decorum in the process.

THE PERIL OF FREEDOM.

The Free-State men of Kansas have just narrowly escaped a general devastation and massacre. Had they been found without arms by the Border Ruffians who recently swarmed over from Missouri, under a call from George Shannon, and by ordinance and munitions stolen from the United States Arsenal on that frontier, threatened Lawrence with destruction, nothing could have saved that citadel of Freedom from being "crushed out" by its implacable enemies. The Free-State journals to which these have been annihilated; the Free-State Constitution recently framed at Topeka would have been trampled under foot. The abominable falsehoods sent forth in justification of the murder of Dow by Coleman, and the kindred murders committed by pro-Slavery bullies on other occasions, would have been woven into the current belief of a majority of our People; and Kansas, overrun by the Ruffians, would have become the dumb and impotent prey of her invaders.

She has been temporarily saved from this fate, first, by the operations of the much abused Liberator,

of this remote journal *The Democrat* in a recent article thus speaks:

"Week after week, and day after day, since the passage of the Kansas-Schuyler bill, *The Republican* has taken every opportunity to insult and defame the people of the East, merely because of their nativity, who seek, under the very provisions of that bill, a settlement in Kansas. And this, notwithstanding the fact that it has risen to its present position of blood, arrogance and swaggering insolence, by the liberal and unswerving patronage it has received from the influential and free-lance of Kansas men in Main street and elsewhere, who, by a change of location to Kansas, would at any time entitle themselves to be reviled and denominated as precisely as those who are the actual recipients of its abuse.

"It has been the great ambition of *The Republican* for some time past to be the more reflex and echo of Atchison and his crew. Gentlemen of our city, bred among Southern institutions and in every respect Southern men, have not thought it necessary to prove their sincerity and fidelity to the South, by an unmitigated abuse of every thing Northern and Eastern; but the editor of *The Republican*, who in 1835 was a brawling Abolitionist and the writer of incendiary articles on the subject of Slavery, cannot afford such magnanimity and fidelity to the South. He must foam at the abuse of everything Northern and Eastern; he has become every opponent with his venom, or his good faith in his present professions might be questioned. This is the usual course of political renegades and trimmers, and *The Republican* has by no means furnished an exception to it."

It is worthy of notice that while every one of the outrages charged upon the Free-State men and excuses for the invasion of Kansas by the Border Ruffians, proved to be false, only a single one of the multiplied outrages charged upon the Border Ruffians has failed to be fully sustained. The charge against them, first published in a Cleveland paper, of having stopped the publication of a Free-Soil paper at Kansas City by assaulting the editor, partially cutting his throat and ripping up his cheeks from mouth to ear, proved to have been wholly unfounded. *The Republican* pronounced it false when first circulated, but added it was a pity it wasn't true.

But while fully acquitting the great body of the decent people of Missouri of any active participation in, or secret favor for the Border Ruffians, this also is to be observed: that these decent people, majority though they be, are completely cowed down by the Border Ruffians, who rule Missouri with the same reign of terror which they have attempted to establish in Kansas. The decent people of Missouri being thus unable to protect themselves, and much less their neighbors, against the infamous rabble congregated on their western frontier, it behooves the people of the Northern States to take care that this tree of liberty, planted with such energy and courage, and watered as it has been with blood, shall not fall, before it has a chance to root itself, by the tomahawks and bowie-knives of the Border Ruffians.

THE PRICES OF FOOD.

We recently published a sensible and forcible letter from Mr. Wm. Renick, a leading stock-grower of Pickaway County, Ohio, on the subject of the ruling prices of Beef Cattle in this market, and their relation to other current prices. Mr. Renick insists, with apparent justice, that Beef at present prices is no higher than other staple articles of food—that it cannot be produced with profit in his section at lower prices—and that, even at current rates, the production is diminishing. We assume all this to be true, and proceed to state some more truth which seems essential to a clear understanding of the whole subject. But let us first set forth more fully the points on which we presume there can be no room for controversy—at least between us and Mr. Renick:

I. Every stock-grower is entitled, as the world goes, to the very highest price which any one can without deception be induced to pay for his product; and he has a perfect legal right to demand twenty-five cents per pound for his fat beef, and refuse to sell it for less. Whether that would or would not be a wise determination, is his own affair altogether.

II. All the resolves of butchers not to pay more than a certain price, aided by newspaper diatribes against the cupidity of growers, drovers, or speculators, will not reduce the price of beef one-half mill per pound—Demand and Supply, in their reciprocal influences, being the only regulators of price.

III. No farmer can be expected to grow food for Beef Cattle on his land when he can more profitably devote it to some other use; nor will he feed corn to his Cattle when the beef thus produced will bring him less than he could sell the Corn for. Of course, when Corn rises in price, Beef must rise also, or its production by feeding Corn will fall off.

—We believe the foregoing are points on which Mr. Renick would fully agree with us, and they cover nearly the whole ground. Yet there is a corner of it which they do not cover, and we will now ask his attention to that:

There is a limited number of consumers, in this as in every city, to whom the price of a favorite article, within probable limits, is no object—who will buy just as many beefsteaks or roasts at twenty-five cents per pound as at twelve or fifteen. But there is a much larger class of consumers who, especially in times of general high prices, must study economy; and who will have fresh beef twice a week when a good four-pound steak costs but fifty cents, when they must've content themselves with one such per week when it costs seventy-five cents, and with none should the price rise to a dollar—substituting for steak some cheaper nourishment.

The clerk or skilled mechanic, who receives five hundred dollars for his year's labor, and must therefore pay house-rent and feed and clothe a family of three to ten persons, must now buy fresh beef for his Sunday dinner, and make pork, fish, or some cheaper substance serve for week-days; the day-laborer, whose yearly income is three hundred or less, must use meat sparingly at best, and the poorer sorts not at all. For, though you say that other staples are enhanced in price as well as beef, it is none the less true that a wholesome, hearty dinner for eight or ten persons on a good housewife be got up of beans, corn-meal, some kind of cheap fish, or a shin-bone for soup, at half the cost of a dinner for the same family composed mainly of fresh beef, potatoes and wheaten bread. Or, in other words, the corn of which Mr. Renick makes a ton of beef would go much further in nourishing and subsisting human beings than the beef will.

There is, therefore, no real discrepancy between Mr. Renick's statements and our occasional cautions to stock-growers and cattle-speculators that the price of Beef in this market cannot be permanently maintained above ten cents per pound. This is an opinion only, to which every one will give just such weight as he sees fit. With money abundant, business brisk, labor fully employed, and the prices of property rising, it may be possible to realize eleven or twelve cents for good beef through a month or two; but in the average of a year, even with war prices prevailing, we think it cannot be. Stock-growers, drovers and cattle-speculators will look over the ground for them-

hitherto been inhibited by law from selling and publishing for not obeying the mandate. In short, let us have a decision which will illuminate and govern the whole subject of Prohibitory Legislation—a decision based on broad principles of Constitutional Right, and not on minute "points" dogmatically raised in arrest of judgment by acute pettiness. Then if the People have by not yet clothed their Legislative agents with power to interdict the chief incentive of vice, outrage, depravity and crime, they may remedy the oversight by a constitutional amendment. If there be indeed "a decision in the path," now is the time to have it authoritatively made known.

THE TRIBUNE (late WHIG) ALMANAC for 1856 is at length issued—much later than we could have wished—but it was impossible to obtain the Election Return from several States in season to issue it earlier. Among the contents of this year's issue is a HISTORY of KANSAS, filling twelve close pages, and giving a condensed history of the Area, Climate, Face of the Country, Soil, Timber, Political Origin, Settlements, Elections, Government, &c., of the new Territory, up to the 1st inst. Every reader of the debates in Congress this Session on the Kansas Question in its various phases should have this synopsis by heart, as it will render clear much that would otherwise be dark and save many moments of perplexity and fruitless questioning. So much reliable information with regard to Kansas cannot so cheaply be obtained elsewhere.

THE ACTS OF CONGRESS at its last Session—the more important given in full, the others merely in substance—fill fourteen pages of the Almanac. The Acts establishing a Court of Claims; creating a Retired List of Naval Officers; remodeling the Diplomatic and Consular Service of the United States; providing for efficient discipline in the Navy; amending the Swamp Land, Cheap Postage and Bounty Land Acts, and the new Passenger Act, are among those given substantially or literally in full; while all the Appropriation Bills are included among those given in summary. We believe these Laws are not elsewhere so cheaply accessible.

A view of the War in Europe in 1855; one of the Weights and Measures of different countries; a list of the Cabinet, Supreme Court, Senate and House of Representatives, (the latter latter classified as well as we could do it a month ago); and Returns by States and Counties of the Elections of 1855, with the usual Almanac matter, complete this little hand-book—which has cost more labor and research than any work of its size ever issued in America. Price 87 per hundred, 25 cents a single copy.

*** We have not yet been able to fill all the orders on our list for the Almanac, but hope to do so in the course of a few days.

"YOUNG'S SCIENTIFIC BASIS OF PROHIBITION."—We learn that the New-York State Temperance Society are now having prepared a cheap edition of this admirable and conclusive treatise, for universal circulation. It will be furnished at the rate of \$1 for one hundred copies, the Society paying the expense of transportation, by post or express, as the case may be. All orders to be addressed, with the money, to O. Scovill, Albany, N. Y. We can add that this most striking argument yet made on the scientific aspect of the question, has received the approval of men like Dr. John W. Warren of Boston, Dr. Francis of this City, and others of similar eminence. It has already been circulated in THE TRIBUNE to the extent of nearly two hundred thousand copies; but we hope it will be even more widely disseminated in its present form.

THE HON. DANIEL WELLS.—The following, says *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, is the letter written by Mr. Wells a few days before the election for Congress, and which, beyond a doubt, secured his election: "I am advised by letters from various parts of the District that a report is current that I voted against the Nebraska and Kansas bill, but was privately told I deem it due to myself and to you to say that all such reports are false. I voted as I thought was right, and I am proud to own the weight of a majority of my constituents, and my actions in all cases correspond with my votes."

"The Hon. Ben. C. Eastman of the Western District of this State and myself voted and acted together in all instances on this bill, and I voted against it on all its stages; and I was opposed by many in his District to his course, but he was right in his decision, and I am proud of his decided opposition to it. For doing as Mr. Eastman did, I am opposed in this District and accused of favoring the bill."

"Milwaukee, Nov. 2, 1855. DANIEL WELLS, &c."

There is no "pledge" of future action in the above, but without such direct placing of himself right, as was equivalent to a pledge, Mr. Wells would not have come to Washington. Now that he is there, he does not just what we said he would do—vote for his party caucus, if the next morning Slavery were fixed upon Kansas without change.

FROM ALBANY.

From Our Own Correspondent.

ALBANY, Friday, Dec. 29, 1855.

Members of the Legislature are arriving and selecting their quarters for the session. Canvassing with regard to organization is going on pretty lively. Mr. Odell of Livingston County, now re-elected as a Know-Nothing, and who occupied a prominent place in the House last session from the same District as a Democrat, is here. He has been suggested as a candidate for the Speakership, who could get all the Know-Nothing votes and sufficient of the Democratic to elect him. Mr. Bailey, Democrat, from Putnam County—a Barnburner member of the House in '46, I believe—is also here. He has been spoken of as being able to secure the Democratic Caucus nomination and secure the full vote of the Democratic members. Mr. Robinson, Democrat, of Oswego, who has been mentioned as a man who would prove acceptable to the Republicans, is also here.

There are also many number of candidates here for the House clerkship, deputy clerkships and doorkeepers. These are mostly of the Democratic stripe, but the three most prominent are Ira P. Barnes of Chenango, W. W. Dean of New-York, and John S. Nafew of Albany. The former was Clerk of the Senate and the latter Clerk of the House in 1854. Mr. Dean was the deputy clerk of the House also in 1854.

The most prominent candidate for the Clerkship of the Senate is William Richardson of this city. His selection appears to be conceded on all hands. I think the Democratic caucus nomination will fall on Mr. Bailey of Putnam for Speaker, and Ira P. Barnes of Chenango for Clerk.

Mr. Foote of Ontario, I think, will be the Republican candidate for Speaker, and Odell of Livingston, the Know-Nothing.

The Governor has determined not to send in his Message on Tuesday, (New-Year's Day,) even should an organization be effected. It is doubtful whether under present appearances, whether he will have the opportunity on Wednesday.

OUR CONGRESSMEN.

MORE ABOUT DR. VALK, M. C.

To the Editor of the N. Y. Tribune.

SIR: The defense of Dr. W. W. Valk, M. C., in your paper of the 27th inst. has just come to my notice. He says that Dr. Valk "always sustained the Nebraska bill, and opposed the restoration of the Missouri Compromise;" and that he "refused to answer 'letters' before election, &c." I wrote him to be better, but in a conversation with him he freely expressed himself opposed to the Nebraska bill, and distinctly said that if he was elected he would vote for the restoration of the Missouri Prohibition if the question came up.

Mine was the honest search after truth. I was not acquainted with any of the candidates, and being so I assumed that the Doctor was Anti-Nebraska, I took it for granted to see him. He then expressed himself so decidedly that I was in good faith, and used my friends to do the same—but find myself not so mistaken—but deceived. "Nassau" knew the Doctor